EXHIBIT N

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Government,

HONORABLE GEORGE CARAM STEEH

v.

No. 12-20064

YAZAKI CORPORATION,

Defendant.

GUILTY PLEA AND SENTENCHIG HEARING

Thursday, March 1, 2012

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: SHANE CRALLE, ESQ.
Assistant U.S. Attorney

For the Defendant: JOHN M. MAJORAS, ESQ.

To Obtain Certified Transcript, Contact: Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, Official Court Reporter Theodore Levin United States Courthouse 231 West Lafayette Boulevard, Room 238 Detroit, Michigan 48226 (313) 962-1234

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

1		E	x	н	В	I	T	S	
2	Identification							Offered	Received
3									
4		N		0		N		E	
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									

1	Detroit, Michigan					
2	Thursday, March 1, 2012					
3						
4						
5	THE CLERK: Case Number 12-20064, United					
6	States of America versus Yazaki Corporation.					
7	THE COURT: Good morning.					
8	Ms. Hellings, do you want to state your					
9	appearance?					
10	MS. HELLINGS: Ms. Hellings for the					
11	government. My colleague will do most of the talking.					
12	THE COURT: All right. I see.					
13	MR. CRALLE: Good morning. Shane Cralle for					
14	the United States.					
15	THE COURT: Good morning.					
16	MR. MAJORAS: Good morning. John Majoras for					
17	Yazaki Corporation from the Jones and Day law firm, and I					
18	have with me today Mr. Takao Soeda, who is the senior					
19	managing director of Yazaki Corporation, and the company's					
20	representative.					
21	THE COURT: Okay. Good morning. All right.					
22	Would you like to approach the podium?					
23	The Court has been presented today with a proposed					
24	Rule 11 plea agreement, and oh, we do have an					
25	interpreter.					

1 Would you like to step up, ma'am? We're going to 2 have two interpreters working today. So I suppose both of 3 you should be sworn in. Would you each raise your right hands, and ask you 4 5 initially identify yourselves, please. INTERPRETER NO. 1: Keiko Olsen. 6 7 INTERPRETER NO. 2: Izumi Suzuki. 8 THE COURT: Go ahead. 9 10 (Interpreters sworn in by deputy clerk.) 11 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 MR. MAJORAS: Your Honor, if I may on the 14 interpreter, Mr. Soeda's first language is, of course, 15 Japanese, but he does speak English. He has assured me that he is comfortable proceeding in English, but if there 16 17 are points in the proceeding in which he would like a 18 translation, that's why we would like to have translators 19 here. 20 THE COURT: I see. Very fine. 21 We will have you sworn. Raise your right hand. 22 23 (Defendant sworn in by deputy clerk.) 24 25 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to first make

sure that I understand what's taking place today. 1 2 The Court has been presented with a proposed Rule 11 plea agreement, and I gather that the defendant 3 corporation has waived its right to indictment already? 4 5 MR. MAJORAS: Yes, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Okay. And there's been an 7 arraignment conducted in the case? 8 MR. MAJORAS: No, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: So we need to arraign the 10 defendant on the information? 11 MR. MAJORAS: Yes, sir. 12 **THE COURT:** And then there's an expectation 13 that there will be a plea of guilty to three counts in the 14 information, is that right? 15 MR. MAJORAS: Yes, sir, and as to the letter 16 to the Court co-signed by myself and the prosecutor, we've 17 asked that the hearing on sentencing also be expedited to 18 today, if it's within your Honor's wishes. THE COURT: Okay. Very fine. 19 20 So would you state your name for us, sir? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Takao Soeda. 22 THE COURT: And Mr. Soeda, your relationship 23 to the defendant Yazaki Corporation is what? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Senior managing director of 25 Yazaki Corporation.

1	THE COURT: And as a representative of the
2	corporation, you have been authorized, as I noticed some
3	documents submitted here, to act in relation to this case
4	on behalf of the corporation?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: And you've had a chance to review
7	the charges in this information with your company
8	colleagues?
9	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
10	THE COURT: And you believe that the charges
11	are understood?
12	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: And you also reviewed with your
14	colleagues at the company this proposed plea agreement
15	that's been presented to the Court?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: And you believe that you and your
18	colleagues at the corporation also understand that
19	agreement?
20	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
21	THE COURT: You had a chance to have all of
22	your questions answered by Mr. Majoras?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
24	THE COURT: All right. Very fine. Well, in
25	relation to the arraignment proceeding, you understand

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sir, that the -- that the charges contained in this information include three counts of conspiracy to restrain trade? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And you understand that the maximum penalty for this charge in relation to each count is what counsel? MR. CRALLE: It's a fine of up to \$100 million or twice the pecuniary gain or twice the pecuniary loss per count. THE COURT: That's right. We've gone over that before. You understand those are the maximum penalties

facing the corporation upon conviction?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: In addition, there is a period of supervision, is there not, that maybe ordered as of a probationary condition?

MR. CRALLE: For the corporation, I don't believe so. Certainly it is within your discretion to impose probation, but we have not done so. We have not requested that.

THE COURT: You're not asking for that? MR. MAJORAS: Your Honor, we would urge that probation not be imposed, if I could be heard on that at

1 some later point? 2 THE COURT: I anticipated that, and I don't see any reason at this point to seriously considered it, 3 but I thought the statute did allow for as among the other 4 penalties a probationary term of supervision, is that 5 6 right? 7 MR. CRALLE: Yes, probation. 8 THE COURT: And you understand that's also 9 provided for by the statute potentially? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Now on behalf of the corporation, 12 you have signed this Rule 11 plea agreement, is that 13 right? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And you've done that with the 15 authority of your employer? 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: And you understand that if the

THE COURT: And you understand that if the Court accepts this plea agreement, you will be paying a total fine for these violations in the amount of 470 million dollars?

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that fine will be spaced out over a five year period with interest accruing on the unbalanced balance of that 470 million from year to year?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: And I did not notice, but I 3 assume there is a formula for calculating that interest that would accrue on that balance? 4 5 MR. CRALLE: That's right. It's a statutory interest amount that's calculated. 6 7 THE COURT: Does that float and vary in 8 percentages from year to year? 9 MR. CRALLE: Correct. The statutory interest 10 rate is calculated and is available on the government's 11 website and tracks the federal reserve interest rates. 12 THE COURT: All right. And you're familiar 13 with that formula, sir? THE DEFENDANT: 14 Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: It is -- it is also part of this 16 agreement that the government would agree not to bring in 17 any additional charges against the corporation for events 18 up to the date of this plea agreement if the company 19 follows through on all of its promises contained in the plea agreement, you understand that? 20 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: And in addition, the government 23 will not bring charges against named individuals employed 24 by the defendant corporation as long as they individually 25 cooperate as anticipated by the plea agreement.

MR. MAJORAS: Your Honor, if I might interject, the named individuals -- there are not named individuals who are subject to the cooperation and the release within the plea agreement, the named individuals of those who are not a part of the agreement.

THE COURT: Okay. So those are excluded, those are named individuals who have already been or maybe charged, is that right?

MR. CRALLE: That's correct, your Honor.

There are individuals named in the plea agreement who face potential charges. Whether they have or have not, it's an ongoing investigation.

THE COURT: I see. Okay. So this plea agreement and the promises made by the defendant corporation would not shield these named individuals from potential prosecution as well, you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you understand that while the payment of this fine amount if that is adopted by the Court at sentencing, would immunize, if you will, the corporation from any charges for events leading up to today's date. The corporation will not be shielded by this agreement from potential taxes that may come due or be assessed because of these occurrences, and one other feature that the corporation might still -- oh, civil

suits --

MR. CRALLE: Correct.

THE COURT: -- might still be entertained as against the corporation for what has occurred, and this agreement would not protect the corporation from the civil suits. Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. The plea agreement includes a factual statement of what occurred here that would give rise to crime liability on behalf of the defendant corporation. Have you gone over that with Mr. Majoras, and do you believe it to be accurate as it's contained in the plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. You understand that the government in this agreement has agreed, based upon the cooperation received, to ask the Court to consider a downward departure at the time of sentencing from the guideline range as it relates to the punishment, the fine, based upon that cooperation, you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And there's a rather complex formula set forth in the plea agreement by which the proposed fine has been calculated. Have you gone over that carefully?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: So you understand that the --3 that the guideline calculation first identifies the culpability score, and I believe in this case it ends 4 up -- I believe the bottom line was at eight point 5 6 culpability score, is that right? 7 MR. CRALLE: That's correct. 8 THE COURT: And you understand how that was 9 reached, sir? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: And you understand that then the 12 government sought to enhance for increase the amount of 13 the fine based upon the -- based upon the economic harm 14 resulting from this conspiracy that would not otherwise 15 have accounted for in the original calculation, you understand? 16 17 MR. MAJORAS: Is your Honor referring to the 18 multiplier? 19 THE COURT: Yes, the multiplier. 2.0 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand. 21 THE COURT: And then the government would 22 request a 30 percent reduction based upon the cooperation 23 that has been forthcoming from the corporation, you 24 understand that? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that all culminates in the recommendation of 470 million. You understand how that was reached?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And as a part of this agreement, you're also asking the Court to adopt both the calculation as it is set forth in the agreement and the bottom line punishment of 470 million dollars?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You have promised as part of this agreement to give up a number of important legal rights that the corporation would otherwise have in the case, you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Among those rights is the right to appeal the convictions and the sentence imposed by the Court for this wrongdoing, as long as that sentence does not exceed the 470 million dollars that's been recommended, you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: In addition, if the Court accepts your plea of guilty on behalf of the corporation to these charges and imposes a sentence of no more than 470 million dollars as a fine to be paid, under those circumstances, the plea today would be final and may not be withdrawn by

the cooperation as well, you understand that? 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Of course, the most important 3 right or set of rights that the corporation is giving up 4 in order to enter to into this agreement is the right to 5 6 have a trial, you understand that? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 8 THE COURT: And you understand at a trial in the case, the corporation would be presumed innocent until 9 10 proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And in addition, the trial would 12 13 take place before a jury of 12 citizens who would make the 14 decision as to the company's quilt or innocence in the 15 case, you understand that? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Under some circumstances, the 18 defendant corporation could waive its right to a jury 19 trial and have the Court alone make the decision, you understand that? 20 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Assuming that the trial would 23 take place with a jury, you understand that a decision by

12-20064; USA v. YAZAKI CORPORATION

the jury, whether it is guilty or not guilty, can only be

received by the Court if it is unanimously agreed upon by

24

25

all of the jurors hearing the case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you understand that the defendant corporation would have the right to be represented by counsel throughout the trial, and assuming that's Mr. Majoras, he would the opportunity to cross examine all the witnesses called by the government to testify against the defendant at the trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And in addition, Mr. Majoras would have the opportunity to ask the Court to issue orders compelling other witnesses to come to court to testify on behalf of the defendant if the corporation wishes, you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You understand that the corporation would have the opportunity to present its own employees and representatives as witnesses in the case?

MR. MAJORAS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: On the other hand, the corporation could sit back and do nothing, and has no obligation to submit any of its employees -- well, the corporation would have the choice to sit back and do nothing and require the government to prove each of the elements of this charge beyond a reasonable doubt at a

1 trial, you understand that? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: So in addition, if found quilty, 3 of course, the corporation would have the right to appeal 4 the conviction and potentially appeal the sentence ordered 5 6 against it by the Court based upon that conviction, you 7 understand that? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Well, by pleading guilty, 9 10 of course, there's not going to be a trial. So the -- so 11 the corporation is necessarily waiving or giving up all 12 the trial rights that we just talked about, you understand 13 that? 14 THE DEFENDANT: I understand. Yes, your 15 Honor. THE COURT: Well, understanding the likely 16 17 consequences of this plea of guilty, and understanding the 18 rights that the corporation is giving up in order to do 19 so, is it still your wish to tender a guilty plea on 20 behalf of corporation to this charge? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: How then does the defendant

Yazaki Corporation plea to the charge of three counts of conspiracy to restrain trade, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor.

22

23

24

25

2.0

THE COURT: All right. And in relation to each count, how would you like to address the factual predicate from the violations?

MR. MAJORAS: Your Honor, I have worked with the Mr. Soeda to put together facts that he can affirm to, and because of the language issues, we would request that I be able to read that and ask him to affirm.

THE COURT: All right. That will be fine.

MR. MAJORAS: We will do that separately with each count, your Honor.

As to the first count to which it pleads, Yazaki manufactured automotive wire harnesses and related products in the United States and elsewhere.

From January 2000 through February 2010, Yazaki engaged in discussions and attended meetings with other producers of automotive wire harnesses and related products. During those meetings and conversations, agreements were reached to allocate supplies of automotive wire harnesses and related products sold to certain automobile manufacturers on a model by model basis, to rig bids quoted to certain automobile manufacturers, and to fix, stabilize and maintain the prices of automotive wire harnesses and related products sold to certain automobile manufacturers in the United States and elsewhere.

During this period, automotive wire harnesses and

2.0

related products sold by Yazaki, as well as payments for the products, traveled in interstate and foreign commerce. Yazaki's business activities in connection with the production and sale of automotive wire harnesses and related products were within the flow of, and substantially affected, interstate and foreign trade and commerce.

The meetings and conversations that I described took place in the United States and elsewhere, and automotive wire harnesses and related products that were the subject of Yazaki's agreements with competitors were sold to certain automobile manufacturers by the Yazaki Corporation's United States subsidiary, which is located here in the Eastern District of Michigan.

As an enterprise, Yazaki employed more than 5,000 individuals during the period. Yazaki's sales of automotive wire harnesses and related products affecting certain automobile manufacturers in the United States and elsewhere totaled approximately \$2 billion during the period of January of 2000 through February 2010.

Mr. Soeda, do you affirm the facts as I read them to the Court?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. MAJORAS: Your Honor, as to the second

2.0

count to which it pleads, Yazaki also manufactured instrument panel clusters, also known as meters, in United States and elsewhere.

From December 2002 through February 2010, Yazaki engaged in discussions and attended meetings with other producers of instrument panel clusters. During those meetings and conversations, agreements were reached to allocate supplies of instrument panel clusters sold to certain automobile manufacturers on model by model basis, to rig bids quoted to certain automobile manufacturers, and to fix, stabilize and maintain the prices of instruments panel clusters sold to certain automobile manufacturers sold in the United States and elsewhere.

During this period, instrument panel clusters sold by Yazaki, as well as payments for those products, traveled interstate and foreign commerce. Yazaki's business activities in connection with the production and sale of instrument panel clusters were within the flow of, and substantially affected, interstate and foreign trade and commerce.

The meetings and conversations that I have described took place in the United States and elsewhere, and instrument panel clusters that were the subject of Yazaki's agreements with competitors were sold to certain automobile manufacturers by Yazaki Corporation's United

2.0

States subsidiary, which is located here in the Eastern District of Michigan.

As an enterprise, Yazaki employed more than 5,000 individuals during the period. Yazaki's sales of instrument panel clusters affecting certain automobile manufacturers in the United States and elsewhere totaled approximately \$73 million during the period of December 2002 through February 2010.

Mr. Soeda, do you affirm those facts as I read them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

MR. MAJORAS: And then, your Honor, as to the third count to which it pleads, Yazaki also manufactured fuel senders in the United States and elsewhere.

From March 2004 through February 2010, Yazaki engaged in the discussions and attended meetings with other producers of fuel senders. During those meetings and conversations which took place in Japan, agreements were reached to fix, stabilize and maintain the prices of fuel senders sold to an automobile manufacturer in the United States and elsewhere.

During this period fuel senders sold by Yazaki, as well as payments for the products traveled, interstate and foreign commerce. Yazaki's business activities in connection with the production and sale of fuel senders

were within the flow of, and substantially affected, interstate and foreign trade and commerce.

The meetings and conversations that I have described took place in Japan, and fuel senders that were the subject of the Yazaki's agreements with competitors were sold to automobile manufacturers by the Yazaki Corporation's United States subsidiary, which is located in Eastern District of Michigan.

As an enterprise, Yazaki employed more than 5,000 individuals during the period. Yazaki's sales of fuel senders affecting an automobile manufacturer in the United States totaled approximately \$1.6 million during the period of March 2004 through February 2010.

Mr. Soeda, do you affirm those facts as I read them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Majoras.

The last thing that I want to make sure that is understood, we've talked about the fact that if the corporation elected to have a trial instead of pleading guilty, it would be the government's burden to prove each element of this charge of conspiracy to restrain trade beyond a reasonable doubt before the corporation could be convicted, you understand that, sir?

2.0

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And in this case those elements generally are that the government would first have to prove that during the term identified in this information, there was an illegal conspiracy underway between at least two persons or entities to restrain trade by bid rigging and -- or price fixing as a general means of carrying out this agreement to suppress competition in the industry. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And then the government would have to prove secondly, that your company voluntarily and knowingly entered into that conspiracy to restrain trade in violation of the Sherman Anti-trust law in order to suppress competition. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else that you believe would be an essential element counsel that would have to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. CRALLE: Yes, your Honor. There's one third element, and we would have to show that the conspiracy was an unreasonable trade of interstate and foreign trade and commerce.

THE COURT: Okay. And you understand that element as well?

Yes, your Honor. 1 THE DEFENDANT: 2 THE COURT: Now counsel, what have I missed in receiving the plea today? Anything that you can think 3 of? 4 MR. CRALLE: Off hand, I think you did very 5 6 good job. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Majoras? 8 MR. MAJORAS: No, sir. THE COURT: The Court is satisfied that the 9 10 plea is voluntary, knowledgeable and accurate. 11 elements of the charge have been established by the testimony received today, and the Court is persuaded that 12 13 Mr. Soeda has been duly authorized by the defendant to tender this plea on its behalf. 14 15 Accordingly, the Court will accept the plea of guilty tendered to each of these counts, adjudicate the 16 17

defendant Yazaki Corporation guilty of the violations, and we'll will turn now to the question of sentence.

The Court has received correspondence from both sides asking the Court to consider imposing sentence immediately.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Court having reviewed the correspondence as well as the sentencing memorandum submitted is persuaded that the Court has ample information and can meaningfully exercise its discretion and the application of the factors

2.0

that are identified at Section 3553(a) of the statute in order to carry out its responsibility to impose sentence, and accordingly, sees no value in requiring the preparation of a Pre-Sentence Investigation Report under those circumstances.

Accordingly, I will grant the joint request made to waive the preparation of a Pre-Sentence Investigation Report, and move to consideration of a sentence immediately.

Mr. Majoras, I'm sure you've read the government's sentencing memorandum, and I'm happy to take any additional comments that you would like to make on behalf of the defendant into account in deciding on a sentence today.

MR. MAJORAS: Thank you, your Honor.

Mr. Soeda would like to make a brief statement as well, but the company is here certainly with great regret with respect to the actions that occurred that led us to today's proceedings.

In regard to that though, the company has also made significant efforts, both to undertake what's been necessary to resolve these issues with the government. It has cooperated fully as your Honor noted. There was a significant discount that the government was able to provide as a result of the cooperation that my client

provided in the course of this investigation. We have been very active throughout essentially the last two years in providing information that the government has sought and information that we have voluntarily provided as part of that investigation.

Additionally, I would like the Court to be aware that the company has instituted revamped compliance procedures with respect not only to the antitrust laws, but also various other laws that affect a corporation the size of Yazaki.

I've been involved in a number of representations of clients and advised on programs, and it is my view the program that the company has put in place is a top line program for compliance involving individual instruction by counsel, involving various web type of programs in which individuals can observe and see in its program that's going to be provided over a course of not just a single, this is the law and don't break it. There's going to be ongoing education.

Additionally, the U.S. subsidiary for Yazaki,
Yazaki North America, has, in fact, retained additional
in-house counsel with anti-trust expertise as part of her
background. She has been very active in working with the
company in providing those compliance programs.

Finally, your Honor, I will note that certainly

the fine that the company has agreed to is a very substantial fine in this case. The company has likewise agreed to various substantial obligations for ongoing cooperation with the government. It is engaged in doing that and intends to be engaged in doing that until the government deems that the cooperation is no longer necessary.

As a result of this significant the fine and the ongoing cooperation, the fact that it will be reminded very clearly of its transgressions on a year to year basis until the fine is paid, we ask that probation in this case not be ordered as being unnecessary in light of those facts.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Majoras.

On behalf of the government, what would you like to address to the Court?

MR. CRALLE: Your Honor, I have nothing further than what's in the papers.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Cralle.

Mr. Soeda, what would you like to say to the Court before sentence is imposed.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

Yazaki Corporation sincerely regrets the actions that led to this proceeding today. We have thoroughly

2.0

reviewed our corporate compliance programs and have taken extensive new steps to ensure future compliance with the anti-trust laws. We have also cooperated to our fullest extent with the Department of Justice's in this investigation.

The company accepts full responsibility for its unlawful conduct. We acknowledge that this conduct merits punishment, and our agreement to accept a fine of this magnitude demonstrates the seriousness of our offenses, and extent to which we have accept the seriousness of the consequences.

We respectfully ask that the Court impose a sentence and fine recommended by the prosecutor and as set forth in the plea agreement.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.

All right. Well, the Court has had the opportunity to review, as I indicated, the sentencing memorandum submitted by the government, and I understand Mr. Majoras that you're in agreement with both the calculation of the guideline range, as well as the request made, the application of the multiplier, as well as the departure from the range that is recommended by the government in its ultimate request for sentence, is that right?

MR. MAJORAS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: That as we touched upon during the plea proceeding, it begins with a calculation of the base fine provided by the guideline provision at 2R1.1(d)(1), which is 20 percent of the affected volume of commerce or as expressed in dollars, \$422.6 million.

The culpability score which is to be determined pursuant to the guideline position at 8C2.5(a) is five.

That is adjusted upwards because of the number of employees of the defendant corporation, which exceeds 5,000 employees. Five points are added, which brings to a subtotal of 10 points assessed.

Then given the defendant's cooperation, the guidelines would adjust the culpability score downwards by two points resulting in a final culpable score of eight.

The fine range is determined by the application of a minimum or maximum multiplier under the guideline provision 8C2.6, and in this instance given the base fine of 422.6 million and the culpability score of eight, the fine range resulting is 676.1 million to \$1.35 billion.

The government then makes its motion for downward departure, which the Court finds to be adequately supported in connection with the request, which is endorsed, of course, by the defendant and its counsel as well, and in connection with that and the assistance provided to the government in its investigation and the

2.0

prosecution of this defendant and others, the recommendation by the government is a departure of 30 percent from the low end of that guideline range to represent a fair and reasonable sentence in the amount of \$470 million.

The Court has first been persuaded that the departure request is adequately supported by the papers filed here, and that the percentage of the departure represents the government's assessment of the value of that cooperation. I don't have any reason based on what's been submitted to think that percentage is unreasonable, in light of the experience in general that's been had by this Court with the level of reductions imposed in other matters based upon assistance from a defendant to the government in those cases.

In addition, the Court needs to assess whether the recommended sentence is one that satisfies the objectives of the sentencing statute in Section 3553(a). The Court is to consider the general seriousness of the offense and the -- and the harm occasion by the violation, as well as -- as well as the background characteristics of the offender in the commission of the violation.

Here the harm is pretty obvious, and it's going to -- the fine amount of 470 million is certainly a reflection, and I think fairly representative of the

magnitude of the harm occasion. In some extent that harm is hard to quantify as expressed in the memorandum received by the government because of the -- because of the far reaching effects, the impact, just not on the supply market and the number of companies should be competing in that market, but on consumers as well.

Because this agreement only encompasses the consequences for the defendant criminally, and because the -- and because civil suits have been filed and will be vigorously prosecuted as well, the Court is persuaded that the ultimate economic impact on this defendant will be very much proportionate to the harm that could be reasonably attributed to the behavior.

Accordingly, the Court is satisfied that the misconduct in this case is fairly accounted for in the recommended sentence that's been recommend to the Court.

Also, as it relates to the second of the statute factors relating to the need for a given sentence to deter this defendant from future violations, and the need to deter others companies from committing similar violations in the future, again, the size of this fine, and the many consequences that go even beyond the fine imposed here, I think will be quite sufficient to deter the company from making this mistake in the future, and will deter others from repeating the mistake as well.

This is also indicated by the corporate compliance policies that have been reviewed and modified to void mistakes like this in the future as well.

The remaining factors under the statute I think are all satisfied substantially by the proposed sentence, and there will be no great value achieved by exceeding the fine recommended for the factors that I discussed in more detail, or the remaining factors that are -- none of which would mitigate in favor of a more severe fine.

That fine is going to be therefore, adopted by the Court as an the penalty in this case.

Accordingly, and pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, the Court will order the defendant Yazaki Corporation to pay a total fine in the amount of \$470 million, payable in the following manner: Within 45 days of today's date, the company shall pay the amount of \$78,333,333.33, plus any accrued interest within 45 days. Then an equal amount payable at the one year anniversary of this sentence, a like sum at the two year anniversary of this sentence, again the same sum at the three year anniversary of this sentence, and again at the fourth and fifth year anniversaries of this sentence, and each of those installments payments of \$78,333,333.33 will be payable along with any accrued interest on the remaining balance at the rate that was discussed here earlier as

provided by statute, and determined by calculation that formulated -- is that determined by the Department of Treasury?

MR. CRALLE: Yes, your Honor. The interest rates do follow the treasury.

If I could make one note, the final payment is slightly different. It is 35 cents as oppose to 33 cents, a slight variation.

MR. MAJORAS: And your Honor, I apologize to interrupt as well, but if we could make pursuant to the order that the Court issues, the company has already made arrangements with the clerk's office to pay by way of wire transfer, and I have found that as helpful if it is in the order that recognizes that payment will be made by wire transfer.

THE COURT: Okay. We will add that to the judgment entered today, and the Court's sentence will not include a term of probation as permitted by statute, given the fact that the cooperation which is agreed upon will be ongoing and the payment schedule is ongoing to this five year period. The Court sees no reason to impose a probationary sentence.

The Court will not be ordering any restitution in this case as well based upon the agreement and the recognition that the civil litigation is going to be

addressing the elements of restitution I'm sure quite 1 2 amply. 3 Anything else that you believe -- is there a special assessment? 4 MR. CRALLE: Special assessment of 400 per 5 6 count. 7 THE COURT: The Court will order a special 8 assessment in the amount of \$400 times three -- 400 in 9 relation to each count, and is there anything else that 10 you can think of? 11 MR. CRALLE: No, your Honor. 12 MR. MAJORAS: No, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: The Court then will impose the sentence as I stated it on the record, and I won't be 14 15 advising the defendant of a right to appeal inasmuch as I accepted the Rule 11 agreement in this case which waives 16 17 the right to appeal the conviction and sentence. 18 Anything else before we adjourn? 19 MR. MAJORAS: Nothing here, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Very fine. Well, thank you for 21 having resolve the matter, and I'll get our judgment out 22 today certainly. 23 MR. MAJORAS: Thank you, your Honor. 24 MR. CRALLE: Thank you. 25 THE COURT: Thank you.

(Proceedings concluded.) CERTIFICATION I, Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, official court reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings in the above-entitled cause on the date hereinbefore set forth. I do further certify that the foregoing transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction. Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, CSR Date Official Court Reporter